

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Claims 1 to 14 are in this application and are presented for the Examiner's consideration in view of the following comments.

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0043768 published March 6, 2003 for Chang et al. (*Chang*). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner states that *Chang* describes Applicants' claimed requirement of acquiring frame synchronization is such a way that the first synchronization channel is used to adjust for a frequency offset. In particular, the Examiner states that the "frequency offset is compensated for within the VCO using primary and secondary synchronization channels". Respectfully, the Examiner is over-stating the description in *Chang*.

*Chang* is clear. The frequency offset estimation is a result of the Phase IV verification, e.g., see signal 353 in Figure 3 of *Chang*. Indeed,

[i]n order to reduce errors caused by the difference in frequency between the transmitted signal and a local reference, the Phase IV verification circuit 350 performs a frequency correction, the result of which is a coarse frequency offset estimation signal on line 353.

*Chang*, paragraph 041, p. 3, emphasis added.

Thus, the phase I acquisition circuit 320 of *Chang* that performs primary synchronization has nothing to do with the frequency correction.

Further the Examiner's statement that the "frequency offset is compensated for within the VCO using primary and secondary channels" simply has no support in *Chang*. In fact, as stated in *Chang* the VCO is simply a periodic reference source. (*Chang*, paragraph 0044, p. 3.) The VCO itself provides no compensation.

In view of the above, *Chang* simply does not describe or suggest Applicants' claimed requirement of "processing a second synchronization channel of the received

wireless signal to acquire frame synchronization in such a way that the first synchronization channel is used to adjust for a frequency offset” as required by claim 1.

As a result of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over *Chang*. Consequently, claims 2 to 5 are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 6-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chang* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,560,298 issued May 6, 2003 to Froehling et al. (*Froehling*). Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons described above with respect to Applicants’ claim 1.

In addition, Applicants respectfully note that Applicants’ independent claims 6 and 10 require “slot synchronization”. Nowhere does *Froehling* even describe using slot synchronization for estimating frequency offset. In fact, the word “slot” only occurs twice in *Froehling* at col. 2, ln. 39, and col. 8, ln. 32. Indeed, the determination of a “slot” in *Froehling* appears to be associated with element 211 and 220 in FIG. 2 of *Froehling* and has nothing to do with element 216 in FIG. 2 of *Froehling*.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit the claims 6-14 are patentable over *Chang* in view of *Froehling*.

As it is believed that all of the objections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' attorney in order to overcome any additional objections that the Examiner might have.

Respectfully submitted  
Louis Robert Litwin et al.

Joseph J. Opalach  
Registration No.: 36,229  
(609) 734-6839

9